



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/081,132	02/21/2002	Michael R. Bloomberg	3524/52	8536	
7590 04/25/2005			EXAMINER		
Brown Raysman Millstein Felder & Steiner LLP			PERSINO, RAYMOND B		
900 Third Aven New York, NY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2682		
			DATE MAILED: 04/25/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/081,132	BLOOMBERG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Raymond B. Persino	2682		

	Raymond B. Persino	2682	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 07 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).	•	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) a
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>07 February 2005</u> . A to the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any repl AMENDMENTS	or any extension thereof (37 CFR	41.37(e)), to avoid dis	missal of the
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further contact. 			ecause
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be	ow);	·	the issues for
appeal; and/or			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		jected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		omnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		, in plicate , an original in	(
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>13-20</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attacl	ned.
11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered by see Examiner's Comments.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper !	Vo(s)	
13.		Man'	
	` /	VALVAN CHIN	
	Shiemmin	TENT EXAMINE	:R
	* , *: V	CENTER 267	

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/081,132

Art Unit: 2682

EXAMINER'S COMMENTS

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/7/2005 have been fully considered but they are not 1. persuasive. The applicant's position is that neither OLSHANSKY, TRANDAL nor Patel, neither alone or in combination, disclose a system that enables use of a computer terminal in a network to access or otherwise participate in both at least one networkrelated function and voice communication over the network in response to means for electronically authentication a finger-image sensed by a finger-image sensor, as claimed in claim 1. The basis of the applicant's position is the argument that OLSHANSKY does not disclose the enablement of both telephone service and a network related function. The applicant concedes that OLSHANSKY discloses enablement of telephone service and services incidental to a telephone call, such as providing billing information or advertisements on the calling party's display. The applicant argues that the services incidental to a telephone call do not qualify as a network related function. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant's claim 1 merely uses the language "network-related function". This language is broad and neither this language nor the remaining language in the claim limits the "network-related function" from being related to the telephone service. Moreover, in lines 2-4 of page 13 of the applicant's specification, it is indicated by example that a network function includes information delivery. Further, the applicant's specification does not limit a network-related function from being related to telephone service. As such, providing

Application/Control Number: 10/081,132

Art Unit: 2682

billing information or advertisements on the calling party's display (both involve information delivery), while related to telephone service, does meet limitation of "network-related function" when considering both the claim and specification. For the preceding reason the examiner maintains the rejections.

Conclusion

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond B. Persino whose telephone number is (571) 272-7856. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian C. Chin can be reached on (571) 272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/081,132

Art Unit: 2682

Raymond B. Persino p / Examiner Art Unit 2682

RP

VIVIAN CHIN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600